

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 36-69 have been added herein. Claims 36-69 remain in the application. No new matter has been added. Consideration and examination is respectfully requested.

### **1. REGARDING OBJECTION TO THE DISCLOSURE:**

In item 1 in the "Specifications" section on page 2 of the Office Action dated 7 June 2004 (Paper No./Mail Date 1) referred to hereinafter as the Office Action of 7 June 2004, the disclosure was objected to because of an informality. The paragraph that begins on page 2 at line 28 and extends onto page 3 ending at line 7 of the Present Application has been amended herein as indicated in the Office Action of 7 June 2004. Thus, Applicant has overcome the disclosure objection of the Office Action of 7 June 2004.

### **2. REGARDING REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, & 6-11 UNDER U.S.C. § 102(e):**

In item 2 in the section entitled "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102" on page 2 of the Office Action of 7 June 2004, claims 1, 2, and 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Guthrie in U.S. Patent Number 6,266,681 entitled "Method and System for Inserting Code to Conditionally Incorporate a User Interface Component in an HTML Document", hereinafter *Guthrie*. Applicant respectively traverses. However, claims 1, 2, and 6-11 are cancelled herein from the Application without prejudice.

### **3. REGARDING REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-5 & 12 UNDER U.S.C. § 103(a):**

In item 10 in the section entitled "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the Office Action of 7 June 2004, claims 3-5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guthrie* in view of *Dasan* in U.S. Patent Number 5,761,662 entitled "Personalized Information Retrieval Using User-Defined Profile", hereinafter *Dasan*. Applicant respectively traverses. However, claims 3-5 and 12 are cancelled herein from the Application without prejudice.

### **4. REGARDING REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13-35:**

In item 13 on page 6 of the Office Action of 7 June 2004, claims 13-35 were rejected as not defining "any new limitations above claims 1-12" but specific rejection category, i.e., 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103, was not specified in the Office Action of 7 June 2004. Applicant respectively traverses this rejection. However, claims 13-35 are cancelled herein from the Application without prejudice.

## **5. REGARDING NEW CLAIMS 36-69:**

As will be shown in the following paragraphs, the cited references fail to teach every element of claims 36-69.

### **Regarding Independent Claims 36, 42, 48 & 59:**

Among other items, the cited references do not disclose "storing the static and dynamic components in a cache" on a server computer, "reading a user profile stored on the client computer", and "rendering the content on the client computer according to the static and dynamic components and the user profile" as claims 36 and 42 of the Present Application do. Also, among other items the cited references do not disclose "storing the multiple preselected content-display components in cache memory on the server" and a client-function component which "comprises information specific to the client" as claims 48 and 59 of the Present Application do.

Thus, Applicant has demonstrated that the cited references fail to teach every element of claims 36, 42, 48, and 59. Because the cited references fail to teach every element of claims 36, 42, 48, and 59, the cited references do not anticipate claims 36, 42, 48, and 59. In addition, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to suggest every element of claims 36, 42, 48, and 59. As such, claims 36, 42, 48, and 59 are allowable over the cited references.

### **Regarding Dependent Claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, & 60-69:**

Because dependent claims 37-41 depend from independent claim 36, it is noted that dependent claims 37-41 have all the features described above for claim 36 as elements. Because dependent claims 43-47 depend from independent claim 42, it is noted that dependent claims 43-47 have all the features described above for claim 42 as elements. Because dependent claims 49-58 depend from independent claim 48, it is noted that dependent claims 49-58 have all the features described above for claim 48 as elements. Because dependent claims 60-69 depend from independent claim 59, it is noted that dependent claims 60-69 have all the features described above for claim 59 as elements. As demonstrated above, independent claims 36, 42, 48, and 59 are not anticipated by the cited references, nor do the cited references, either alone or in combination, suggest every element of claims 36, 42, 48, and 59.

Thus, the cited references fail to teach every element of each of the claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, and 60-69. Because the cited references fail to teach every element of each of the claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, and 60-69, the cited references do not anticipate claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, and 60-69. In addition, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to suggest every element of claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, and 60-69. As such, claims 37-41, 43-47, 49-58, and 60-69 are allowable over the cited references.

**6. IN CONCLUSION:**

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that all claims pending in the Present Application as described above are allowable and that all other issues raised by the Examiner have been rectified. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his rejections and to grant an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

by 

Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Reg. No. 43,955

September 20, 2004  
Loveland, CO 80537  
(970) 669-1266